	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Notice of Allowability	10/687,718	CIRULLI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	WILLIAM J. ALLEN	3625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to *the response filed 4/15/2008 and Examiner's Amendment transmitted herewith*.

2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are *20 and 21*.

3. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some*   c) ☐ None   of the:

        1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * Certified copies not received: _____ .

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application. **THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.**

4. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.

5. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.

    (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached

        1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date _____ .

    (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date _____ .

    Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).

6. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

1. ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2. ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3. ☐ Information Disclosure Statements (PTO/SB/08), Paper No./Mail Date _____

4. ☐ Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit of Biological Material

5. ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6. ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413), Paper No./Mail Date *20080625* .

7. ☒ Examiner's Amendment/Comment

8. ☒ Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance

9. ☐ Other _____ .

/Jeffrey A. Smith/
Jeffrey A. Smith
SPE AU 3625

DETAILED ACTION

Prosecution History Summary

Claims 1-19 have been canceled previously.

Claims 20-21 are pending and allowable as set forth below.

Examiner's Amendment

An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with John Sensny on 6/24/2008.

The application has been amended as follows:

In the Title

The title has been amended to read as follows:

--Synchronous electronic requisition processing methods--

In the Claims

20. (Currently Amended) ~~An~~ A synchronous electronic requisition processing method,

comprising the computer implemented steps of:

a user preparing an electronic requisition form including a proposal for a requisition,

~~wherein~~ said proposal ~~requires~~ requiring approval by each of a plurality of approvers[[;]],

wherein the preparing step further includes the step of the user submitting the proposal, whereby,

in response to the submission, the proposal is immediately available for approval;

establishing an electronic list of the approvers for ~~the~~ said proposal; ~~for the requisition;~~

~~and~~

an approver delegating approval authority to a delegate for a period of time and resuming

approval authority a the end of the period of time;

at least some of said approvers approving said proposal, and in response to ~~each time one~~

~~of~~ at least some of said approvers ~~approves~~ approving the proposal, dynamically recalculating

the list to take into account the current availability of the approvers further down on the list[[;]]

~~and~~ ,wherein, the step of dynamically recalculating the list of ~~the~~ approvers further includes the

steps of:

taking into account any delegates ~~or new approver names~~ that are further down in the list

from the current approver when the approver delegating approval authority has not resumed

approval authority; and ~~wherein:~~

pulling the name of the approver delegating approval authority back onto the list when

the approver delegating approval authority has resumed authority;

~~the preparing step includes the step of a user submitting the proposal;~~

~~the requisition process is synchronous, whereby upon submission of the proposal, the~~

~~proposal is immediately available for approval by a first of the approvers; and~~

the method further comprising ~~the further~~ steps of:

providing each of the approvers with a view of the proposal;

[[the]] a first approver approving the proposal, and the act of the first approver approving

the proposal sending an email to a second of the approvers;

the user checking to see which approvers have approved the proposal; and

the user canceling the proposal, said canceling sending an email to all of the approvers

informing the approvers that the proposal has been canceled.

21. (Currently Amended) ~~An~~ A synchronous electronic requisition processing method,

comprising the computer implemented steps of:

a user preparing an electronic requisition form including a proposal for a requisition,

wherein said proposal requires approval by each of a plurality of approvers;

establishing an electronic list of the approvers for the proposal for the requisition; and

at least one of the approvers delegating approval authority to a delegate for a period of

time and resuming approval authority at the end of said period of time;

each time ~~one of~~ at least some of said approvers approves the proposal, dynamically

recalculating the list to take into account the current availability of the approvers further down on

the list[[;]] ~~and~~

~~one of the approvers delegating approval authority for a period of time, but resuming~~

~~approval authority at the end of said time period; and~~

wherein, the step of dynamically recalculating the list of approvers includes the ~~step~~ <u>steps</u>

of[[,]]<u>:</u>

<u>determining that the at least one of the approvers delegating approval authority has</u>

<u>resumed authority; and</u>

<u>in response to determining that the at least one of the approvers delegating approval</u>

<u>authority has resumed authority, pulling the name of the approver delegating approval authority</u>

<u>back onto the list;</u>

~~some of the approvers editing properties of requisition;~~

~~the preparing step includes the step of a user submitting the proposal;~~

~~the requisition process is synchronous, whereby upon submission of the proposal, the~~

~~proposal is immediately available for approval by a first of the approvers; and~~

<u>the method further</u> comprising the ~~further~~ steps of:

<u>making the proposal immediately available for approval upon submission by the user;</u>

providing each of the approvers with a view of the proposal;

<u>at least one of the approvers editing properties of the proposal;</u>

~~the~~ <u>a</u> first approver approving the proposal, and the act of the first approver approving the

proposal sending an email to a second of the approvers;

the user checking to see which approvers have approved the proposal; and

the user canceling the proposal, said canceling sending an email to all of the approvers informing

the approvers that the proposal has been canceled.

Allowable Subject Matter

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Upon review of the evidence at hand, it is hereby concluded that the evidence obtained and made of record, alone or in combination, neither anticipates, reasonably teaches, nor renders obvious the below noted features of applicant's invention as the noted features amount to more than a predictable use of elements in the prior art. The allowable features are as follows:

Regarding claim 20, the prior art fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious "at least some of said approvers approving said proposal, and in response to at least some of said approvers approving the proposal, dynamically recalculating the list to take into account the current availability of the approvers further down on the list, wherein, the step of dynamically recalculating the list of approvers further includes the steps of:

taking into account any delegates that are further down in the list from the current approver when the approver delegating approval authority has not resumed approval authority; and

pulling the name of the approver delegating approval authority back onto the list when the approver delegating approval authority has resumed authority".

Regarding claim 21, the prior art fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious "each time at least some of said approvers approves the proposal, dynamically recalculating the list to take into account the current availability of the approvers further down on the list, wherein, the step of dynamically recalculating the list of approvers includes the steps of:

determining that the at least one of the approvers delegating approval authority has resumed authority; and

in response to determining that the at least one of the approvers delegating approval authority has resumed authority, pulling the name of the approver delegating approval authority back onto the list".

As noted above, claim 20 requires that a list of approvers be established and dynamically recalculated when at least some (i.e. at least one) approver approves the proposal. The dynamic r4ecalculation includes both taking into account any delegates that should be present on the list and pulling an approver who has delegated authority back onto the list when appropriate. Similarly, claim 21 requires that each time an approver approves the proposal, the list is dynamically recalculated, the dynamic recalculation including determining that the at least one of the approvers delegating approval authority has resumed authority and subsequently pulling the name of the approver delegating approval authority back onto the list. In other words, regarding both claims 20 and 21, each time a proposal is approved by an approver, the established list is recalculated to ensure that the list of approvers is accurate with regards to the names on the list and approvers that should be receiving the proposal for approval down the line.

With this in mind, the most felicitous prior art made of record includes Lemble (US 5315504), Altman (US 6721921), and Adams (US 7117165). Lemble teaches an approval system that includes changing the displayed name of the user according to the most recent approver to have acted on the requisition (i.e. displaying the previous approver who last acted on the requisition). Furthermore, Lemble teaches displaying an approver list with the decisions of approvers who have already acted on the requisition. Lemble, however, does not teach or render obvious the above noted dynamic recalculation.

In the same field of endeavor, Altman teaches tracking annotations and changes to a document, who has reviewed a document, if every required reviewer has reviewed the document, etc. Altman additionally teaches the user notifying the system that he/she has acted upon and finished reviewing a specified document. Upon receipt of such a notification, the system records

that the review is complete and removes the reviewer from the list of people to get reminders. Although Altman teaches changing the names on the list by removing approvers who have completed the approval, Altman only provides the generic aspect of changing/removing names, which broadly reads on the recalculation of a list but does not teach or render obvious a dynamic recalculation that takes into account any delegates and approvers resuming authority when performing the recalculation.

Also in the field of electronic approvals, Adams specifically teaches the delegation of authority of one approver for another for a specified period of time. If there is a delegation of authority for an employee, and the date for the delegation has not expired, then the system will allow the delegate to approve in the place of the employee. Though Adams teaches the delegation, Adams merely allows a delegate to approve in place of the delegating employee if the time period has not expired. There is no dynamic recalculation of an established list that facilitates the name of an approver delegating authority to be pulled back on the list in response to another approver approving the proposal.

In addition to the above, the Examiner emphasizes the interrelation of the above distinguishing elements with the remainder of each respective claim element, and further notes that it is that interrelation that truly distinguishes Applicant's invention from the evidence at hand. Moreover, none of the evidence at hand teaches or suggests the combination of features claimed, nor does there exist an appropriate rationale for further modification of the evidence at hand.

It is hereby asserted by the Examiner that, in light of the above and in further deliberation over all of the evidence at hand, that the claims are allowable as the evidence at hand does not

anticipate the claims and does not render obvious any further modification of the references to a

person of ordinary skill in the art.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the

payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue

fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for

Allowance."

Conclusion

The prior art made of record is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure but fails to remedy the above noted deficiencies:

Us Patents/PG Pubs

- US 5825880 A and US 6209091 B1 disclose a multi-step digital signature method and system

- US 20020013898 A1 discloses a method and apparatus for roaming use of cryptographic values

Non-Patent Literature

- PTO 892 U discloses mySAP Business Suite, which provides a cutting edge platform for user to develop and approve requisitions.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to WILLIAM J. ALLEN whose telephone number is (571)272-1443. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff A. Smith can be reached on (571) 272-6763. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jeffrey A. Smith/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
3625

/William J Allen/
Examiner, Art Unit 3625